DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY ENLISTED RECORDS AND EVALUATION CENTER
8899 EAST 56TH STREET
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46249-5301

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

PCRE-B

24 June 2002

MEMORANDUM FOR Commandant, United States Army Intelligence Center and Fort Huachuca (ATZS-MI), Fort Huachuca, AZ 85613

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 96 Review and Analysis

1. Reference: Memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 3 May 2002, SUBJECT: Memorandum of Instruction for the CY02 Sergeant First Class Selection Board.

2. In accordance with the referenced memorandum, the selection board panel reviewing records for CMF 96 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for MOS within this CMF.

3. Competence assessment (strengths and weaknesses).

a. Primary zone (PZ).

(1) Performance and potential:

(a) Performance and potential were the primary basis for selection on this year's CMF 96, SFC Promotion Board. We placed emphasis on how well SSGs performed, and then matters of assignments, military and civilian education, physical fitness, and special accomplishments such as the Sergeant Audie Murphy Club further defined their position on the Order of Merit List (OML).

(b) Strong performance over a sustained period of time was essential. This challenges the need for SSGs to concern themselves with Complete the Record NCOERs, as we weren't distinguishing NCOs who held a Platoon Sergeant job, for example, for three or four months.

(c) There was one challenge in determining a SSG's performance that was prevalent throughout the CMF 96. Many SSGs produce reports, and their raters would try to justify excellence on the NCOER by simply stating the rated NCO produced a lot of reports. Every SSG analyst produced a lot of reports. If raters are trying to justify excellence, they need to quantify it (e.g., SSG Jones produced 1,000 accurate and timely reports, 10% above any other analyst in CENTCOM).

(d) Senior civilians and members of our sister services were responsible for the worst of inflated evaluations. This isn't a new issue. As many of our SSGs are not near Army senior NCOs and officers to assist in the writing of their NCOERs, it's incumbent on the rated NCO to teach the rater and senior rater what justifies excellence. We think it's reasonable for us to expect this of an NCO we are considering for promotion to SFC.

(e) On the other hand, SSGs and lieutenants often under-rated SSGs. The rated SSGs had often distinguished themselves with excellent performance, but the rating officials didn't give them credit by checking the excellence block or grouping them in the Among the Best category. In several cases, SSGs had three excellence blocks checked and were categorized as fully capable.

(f) Some of the best NCOERs we reviewed only addressed what the rated SSG did to justify excellence. Many raters appear compelled to fill the blocks up with "fluff." Statements like "looks like an NCO" or "takes care of his soldiers" are meaningless statements. Also, the bullet used to justify excellence needs to be the first bullet. It was frustrating to the panel members to have to sift through the "fluff" to find the true justification.

(g) Raters should also consider OPSEC when writing their bullet comments. Many 96Ds in particular had comments that indicated we collected on specific targets in a given country.

(2) Utilization and assignments: Very few matters of misutilization surfaced during the board. They were limited to incidents such as a 97B working in the motor pool as a motor sergeant. As mentioned before, performance and potential were the primary basis for selection, so SSGs who were serving the needs of the Army in positions out of their MOS were not discriminated against. SSGs who were working as Recruiters, Drill Sergeants, Instructors, and Platoon Sergeants fared well in the eyes of the board members. However, many SSGs working as Recruiters had generally lower evaluations of performance. NCOs working in E7 positions also received additional consideration.

(3) Training and education: Many of the CMF 96 SSGs are behind in the area of civilian education. We reviewed several HS GRAD files to see if we could find a reason for the lack of civilian education, but there was none. The SSGs hadn't been in tactical assignments or on watch shifts. We couldn't find any reason for them not attending school. The CMF 33 and 98 SSGs are all doing the same tough jobs, but they seem to be getting their civilian education. We need to put more emphasis on our CMF 96 soldiers getting educated. The Army will gain a great deal from having better educated NCOs in the CMF 96.

(4) Physical Fitness. CMF 96 SSGs appeared to be in generally good shape, and SSGs with profiles are being evaluated for suitability. We did not penalize SSGs who had physical profiles. Earning the Army Physical Fitness Badge weighed favorably with the panel members. We did make one observation that raters would say that their SSG was NOT in compliance with AR 600-9 but didn't rate as "needs improvement." This sent a confusing signal to the board members.

(5) Overall career management field. The number of SSGs who didn't have official DA photos shocked the panel members. This was a basic requirement set forth in the original SFC zone of consideration announcement message, disseminated months ago. Further, every SSG is directed in their administrative promotion order to take and submit an official DA photo within 60 days of promotion. As many as 27% of SSGs in some CMF 96 MOSs didn't have an official photo.

b. Secondary zone (SZ).

(1) Performance and potential: All the same matters addressed in the Primary Zone apply to the Secondary Zone as well. The one obvious difference is that SZ SSGs haven't had the opportunities and experiences to be competitive with many of the PZ SSGs.

(2) Utilization and assignments. Same as PZ

(3) Training and education. Same as PZ

(4) Physical Fitness. Same as PZ

(5) Overall career management. Same as PZ

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF. No issues

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure. No issues

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity. No issues

d. Overall health of CMF. No issues

e. Other, as appropriate. No issues

5. Recommendations (proposals keyed to subparagraphs above)

a. Competence. No issues

b. CMF structure and career progression. No issues

c. Other(s) as appropriate. No issues

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality. The CMF 96 proponent packet was thorough and fully prepared us to evaluate the CMF's records.

b. Recommended improvements: We viewed the Great Skills Program insert as overly embellishing. To say that their SSGs are filling responsibilities commensurate with a Brigade Operations NCO (SGM?) is unbelievable. There are only 100 soldiers in their entire worldwide organization. Further, that the Great Skills organization puts another embellishing insert in every one of their SSG's records seems unfair. No other organization or chain of command is afforded this opportunity to draw attention to their soldiers, solely based on their affiliation with a unit.

STEVEN L. ANDRASCHKO
COL, MP
Panel Chief

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY ENLISTED RECORDS AND EVALUATION CENTER
8899 EAST 56TH STREET
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46249-5301

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

PCRE-B

24 June 2002

MEMORANDUM FOR Commandant, United States Army Intelligence Center and Fort Huachuca (ATZS-MI), Fort Huachuca, AZ 85613

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 33W Review and Analysis

1. Reference: Memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 3 May 2002, SUBJECT: Memorandum of Instruction for the CY02 Sergeant First Class Selection Board.

2. In accordance with the referenced memorandum, the selection board panel reviewing records for CMF 33W submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for MOS within this CMF.

3. Competence assessment (strengths and weaknesses).

a. Primary zone.

(1) Performance and potential (particularly leadership opportunities).

(a) The panel members on this board considered performance and potential ratings from the Rater and Senior Rater heavily. Our focus was on how the soldiers performed at the current level and how they performed in positions of greater responsibility. The records reflected NCOs with good technical knowledge and skills but lacking in troop leading skills, teaching soldiers how, and sharing knowledge and experience.

(b) The overall performance and potential ratings from the Rater and Senior Rater were average for most of the CMF. There were inconsistencies noted between the Rater and Senior Rater. An example is when the Rater would rate low and Senior Rater would rate the soldier high. Most NCOs lagged in leadership duties one grade above their present grade. Soldiers need to seek out the tough jobs and positions of increased responsibility.

(c) The panel viewed increased responsibility in jobs such as Drill Sergeant duties, Instructors, and Recruiting duties favorably. The entire CMF did not have many soldiers who had completed a tour of duty as a Drill Sergeant. Soldiers who are members of the SGT Audie Murphy and SGT Morales Club further enhance their promotion potential.

(2) Utilization and assignments (particularly in PMOS). Overall, the CMF is properly utilizing soldiers in their PMOS. There were a few cases where soldiers were being utilized outside of their PMOS and being used totally in their SMOS. All soldier's records reflected a variety of assignments. There were some instances where soldiers had extended longevity at certain stations (i.e. Remote SIGINT Operation Center) and not a variety of other assignments in FORSCOM and TRADOC units.

(3) Training and education. Overall, the training in the CMF is being conducted/attended but the NCOs fail to annotate the training on their DA Form 2-1 and their microfiche. Soldiers at certain locations get extensive training in Computer Network Operations and Local Area Network. Soldiers should ensure that the documents accurately reflect the training they have received. Some NCOs are lacking college education. To stay competitive for promotion, civilian education is important.

(4) Physical Fitness. NCOs in the CMF are meeting the APFT Standards. Very few, however, are exceeding the standards by being awarded the Physical Fitness Badge. I did not see much participation in unit sporting events. Overall, appearance of the soldiers in uniform is very good.

(5) Overall career management. The CMF 33 Branch is managing the assignments within the CMF very well. Overall the records reflect the soldiers have a variety of duty assignments.

b. Secondary zone.

(1) Performance and potential (particularly leadership opportunities). Same as above.

(2) Utilization and assignments (particularly in PMOS). Same as above.

(3) Training and education. NCOs need to ensure their training data is updated on the microfiche and personnel qualification records. Many soldiers simply signed the PQR documents without updating their information. Most soldiers need to begin taking college courses. Some lack any college in their records. To be competitive for promotion, civilian education is important.

(4) Physical Fitness. Same as above.

(5) Overall career management. Same as above.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF. The duty descriptions, throughout the CMF, reflect compatibility within the CMF. Civilian raters need to indicate the dollar value amounts of equipment their soldiers are responsible for in their duty description. Civilian raters need to better quantify the performance of the NCOs and not over inflate their duty performance by using flowery words.

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure. No comment.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity. Soldiers should seek out positions of greater responsibility (Drill Sergeant Duty, Recruiter Duty, Instructor). Raters need to better quantify what their rated soldiers are doing.

d. Overall health of CMF. The overall health of the CMF is excellent. Soldiers are performing their primary duties and additional duties not covered in the MOS requirements.

5. Recommendations (proposals keyed to subparagraphs above)

a. Competence. The NCOs are fully qualified in their MOS. The CMF as a whole needs to better quantify the NCO's performance during the rating period.

b. CMF structure and career progression. Current Army trends of Civilian Contractor Logistics Support Maintenance for the life cycle of new systems decreases the number of CMF-wide 33 positions in the field. The trend slows the progression and eliminates the variety of assignments available for soldiers in the CMF.

c. Other comments.

(1) Recommend leaders in the field fully document the Computer Network Operation and Local Area Network skills their soldiers are performing. These skill sets should be reviewed during the upcoming CTSSB being held at Fort Huachuca, AZ.

(2) Recommend soldiers attempt to get assignments in FORSCOM units, INSCOM units, and TRADOC units.

(3) NCOs are reviewing their PQR but not updating the information being reviewed. Recommend soldiers begin their records review process well in advance of the board. They need to ensure that all information is posted to their microfiche as well as their DA Form 2-1 and ERB.

(4) Soldiers need to pay more attention to detail when taking their DA Photo. Some photos had the wrong MOS listed on the photos. Uniform coat sleeves were short. Photos did not accurately reflect their awards and service time. Some photos were older than five years, poor quality, or absent from files.

(5) NCO's CMF- wide need to take the opportunity to compete in NCO of the Month boards as well as to become Sergeant Morales and Sergeant Audie Murphy Club members.

6. CMF Proponent Packets. The CMF 33 packet was well presented. It helped with the evaluation process to provide panel members with in-depth explanations of the CMF 33 duties and responsibilities.

STEVEN L. ANDRASCHKO
COL, MP
Panel Chief

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY ENLISTED RECORDS AND EVALUATION CENTER
8899 EAST 56TH STREET
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46249-5301

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

PCRE-B

24 June 2002

MEMORANDUM FOR Commandant, United States Army Intelligence Center and Fort Huachuca (ATZS-MI), Fort Huachuca, AZ 85613

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 98 Review and Analysis

1. Reference: Memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 3 May 2002, SUBJECT: Memorandum of Instruction for the CY02 Sergeant First Class Selection Board.

2. In accordance with the referenced memorandum, the selection board panel reviewing records for CMF 98 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for MOS within this CMF.

3. Competence assessment (strengths and weaknesses).

a. Primary zone.

(1) Performance and potential (particularly leadership opportunities). The opportunity for soldiers to serve in key leadership positions was not an issue. Ample opportunities were available. Those NCOs that served successfully in leadership positions for extended periods of time were very competitive for promotion. The 98K MOS had fewer opportunities and lagged behind the rest of the CMF 98. Those soldiers serving as Drill Sergeants or in positions of higher grade (SSG working in a SFC position) had the best opportunity for promotion.

(2) Utilization and assignments (particularly in PMOS). Proper utilization is important and was not a major issue. However, those soldiers not working their PMOS were not as competitive as their peers. Soldiers with a variety of assignments, tactical and strategic, had an overall advantage. Staying too long in one position that did not rate as being a leadership position sent a negative signal to the board. Those soldiers seeking the tough assignments and leadership positions early in their careers were very competitive for promotion.

(3) Training and education. The CMF 98 has some of the best-trained and educated soldiers in the force. Most soldiers have more than 30 semester hours of college with a higher percentage of documented degrees (Associates and higher) than other CMFs. Files of NCOs who pursued additional military schools and training stood out. Soldiers that had both college and additional military schooling were viewed favorably (emphasis on performance/potential). The 98G MOS had the most soldiers with college degrees with the 98K MOS the least.

(4) Physical Fitness. Overall the CMF 98 NCOs are physically fit. NCOs exceeding the standard and earning the APFT badge obviously improved their opportunity for promotion selection. Raters and Senior Raters need to do a better job in documenting those soldiers that are not meeting the standards. An NCO with a "needs improvement" in the physical fitness block without the proper explanation sent a confusing signal. NCOs on extended profiles for several rating periods without proper justification/explanation were not viewed as favorably as their peers.

(5) Overall career management. Overall the CMF 98 is in great shape. NCOs have ample opportunities to excel and get the key leadership positions needed to be competitive for promotion. Obviously, soldiers selected for promotion are those soldiers seeking the hard leadership positions and they are successful at them. The 98H MOS had the most NCOs working out of MOS and they need to be managed more closely. The 98H NCOs assigned to tactical assignments need to be closely monitored to ensure they work their PMOS. The 98K MOS does not offer many leadership positions therefore creating a scenario for these NCOs to be less competitive for future promotions to MSG and SGM.

b. Secondary zone.

(1) Performance and potential (particularly leadership opportunities). NCOs in the Secondary Zone were some of the best soldiers seen. The Senior Rater evaluations for these soldiers were critical when addressing performance and potential.

(2) Utilization and assignments (particularly in PMOS). Overall, soldiers in the secondary zone are being used correctly. It is critical for soldiers selected from this zone to be properly utilized.

(3) Training and education. Most NCOs appearing in the secondary zone had ample college and more military training than their peers in other CMFs.

(4) Physical Fitness. Same comments as Primary Zone files.

(5) Overall career management. It is key that in order for soldiers to be competitive for promotion in the secondary zone that they be managed properly and hold key leadership positions or work in a higher grade. Those NCOs successfully holding Drill Sergeant positions, SFC instructor billets, or Platoon Sergeant positions were the most competitive. The DA photo is essential and key to selection. More NCOs in the secondary zone elected not to get a photo than their peers in the primary zone. This immediately sent a negative message to the panel members.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF. The 98K MOS is less competitive than other 98 MOSs when it comes to getting leadership positions. NCOs in the 98K MOS need to be selected for key leadership positions such as Drill Sergeant. They lag behind other 98 MOSs in this department. If this situation is not addressed, 98K NCOs will not be as competitive for promotion to MSG and SGM. The 98H MOS is not being utilized correctly in certain assignments. 98H NCOs assigned to tactical assignments need to be managed closely to ensure they are being assigned to duty in their PMOS.

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure. No comments.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity. Overall the CMF 98 is in good shape. Certain NCOs assigned to Recruiter duties were rated lower than their peers who were not serving as detailed Recruiters. Being successful in leadership positions is the key to being promoted. Those soldiers selecting hard jobs/assignments had a decisive edge for promotions.

d. Overall health of CMF. Very good overall. The 98H and 98K MOS need to be managed closely to ensure proper utilization. The Great Skills Program was considered as another factor for a soldier to be promoted to the next higher grade. However, the comparison of a soldier in the Great Skills Program to doing the job of a Brigade Operations NCO (SGM?) seemed exaggerated and sent mixed signals to board members.

5. Recommendations (proposals keyed to subparagraphs above)

a. Competence. No concerns or issues.

b. CMF structure and career progression. The CMF 98 offers great opportunities for soldiers that desire to advance. The 98K MOS offers less of an opportunity than other CMF 98 MOSs. This will make them less competitive for selection to MSG and SGM. Drill Sergeant and other leadership positions need to be made available for soldiers in the 98K MOS. It is clear that soldiers in the 98H MOS in tactical assignments are not being used in their PMOS. Their technical skills will erode if this trend continues and it will limit their opportunity to advance.

c. Other(s) as appropriate. NCOERs are the key to promotions and schools. The Chain of Command and Command Sergeant Major must ensure accuracy and compliance on all NCOERs. There is a disconnect when a Senior Rater rates an NCO with a "1" block and the soldier gets a "needs improvement" from the Rater. Excellence bullets have to be justified.

c. The first bullet has to be the most influential with quantifying data. NCOs receiving a "needs improvement" bullet must have a specific explanation justifying the bullet. If not, a confusing message is sent to board members.
Again, the NCOER is the primary document used to determine an NCOs potential for promotion. It has to be viewed as a critical document by the chain of command.

6. CMF Proponent Packets. Very informative. One exception is the explanation of the Great Skills Program. Military Intelligence panel members felt the description of this program was exaggerated. A brief explanation of the program without the dramatics [comparing Great Skills jobs to Brigade Operations NCO (SGM) positions] would more accurately portray the importance of the program to the rest of the Army.

STEVEN L. ANDRASCHKO
COL, MP
Panel Chief